

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement drawing sheet makes changes to Fig. 2 and replaces the original sheet with Fig. 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification is amended with the inclusion of the attached amended Abstract and a replacement drawing sheet that makes changes to Fig. 2. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 2, objects to the specification, and specifically the Abstract, for an informality. The Abstract is amended with the inclusion of the attached amended Abstract. Withdrawal of the objection to the specification, and specifically the Abstract, is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 3, objects to the drawings as allegedly not showing every feature specified in the claims. Specifically, the Office Action enumerates a number of device features recited in claims 1 and 11 that are alleged not to be shown in the drawings. Applicant amends Fig. 2 with the inclusion of the attached replacement drawing sheet showing all of the features specified in the claim. The amendments to the drawing introduce no new matter because they are supported by the claims as originally filed. Fig. 2 represents an exemplary embodiment of the subject matter of the pending claims. No specific configuration of the depicted devices is intended or implied beyond which can reasonably be construed from the features recited in the pending claims. As such, the objection to the drawings is obviated. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 3, objects to claims 1 and 11 because of an informality. The Office Action indicates that it appears that several of the devices positively recited in claims 1 and 11 are considered to be process steps of a microcomputer. This conclusion is incorrect. Each of the listed devices may be implemented in any manner commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art. As such, it is improper to read these separately enumerated

devices as simply process steps of a microcomputer. This conclusion is apparently arrived at through review of Fig. 2 prior to amendment and inputs from Applicant's representatives in response to inquiries from the Examiner. These inputs may have been misinterpreted based on the conclusions that the Office Action seems to have drawn from these inputs. Fig. 2 is amended to show all of the separate devices recited in the pending claims. These devices are adequately described in Applicant's disclosure, and in the claims, as originally filed. These devices would have been understood to those of ordinary skill in the art based on the disclosure and the claims, as originally filed, as constituting devices that could be individually implemented in a number of ways to achieve the objective of the claimed subject matter. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 1 and 11 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 4, indicates that claims 2-10 recite allowable subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action indicates that these claims would be allowable is rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant appreciates this indication of allowability but respectfully submits that at least independent claim 1, from which these claims directly or indirectly depend, is allowable for at least the reasons set forth below.

The Office Action, on page 3, rejects claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0099528 A1 to Hattori. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hattori is not available as prior art because Applicant claims priority from Japanese Patent Application No. 2003-309012 (hereinafter "JP '392") filed on September 1, 2003, which date is prior to the November 14, 2003 filing date of Hattori. The claim of priority was filed on March 25, 2005. A certified copy of the priority document was filed in PCT Application JP 2004/013016, upon which the Applicant also relies claims priority. Receipt of the priority documents has been acknowledged by the Patent Office. An accurate English-

language translation of the priority document is attached, along with a statement that the translation is accurate, in compliance with MPEP §201.13.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hattori are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1 and 11, in addition to the indicated allowable subject matter of claims 2-10, are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Klifton K. Kime
Registration No. 42,733

JAO:KLK/jam

Attachments:

Accurate Translation of Priority Document
Japanese Application No. 2003-309012, filed September 1, 2003
Substitute Abstract
Replacement Drawing Sheet (Fig. 2)

Date: August 8, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
